REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

By way of the instant amendment, claim 15 has been canceled. Thus, claims 1-14 and 16-20 remain for examination.

Per the examiner's request in paragraph 1 of the outstanding office action, the specification has been reviewed and amended in order to place same more in compliance with U.S. practice.

In compliance with paragraph 2 of the outstanding Office Action, an amended abstract is being submitted herewith.

Claims 4-6, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The various grounds of rejection are set forth in paragraphs 5-9 of the outstanding Office Action.

Applicant has amended the claims in order to clarify the specific grounds of rejection set forth in paragraphs 5-9 of the outstanding Office Action and has also amended the claims in order to place them more in compliance with U.S. practice. Claim 15 has been canceled.

It is submitted that all of applicant's claims fully comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Graham-Cumming (6,182,146).

The examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's amended method claim 1 is directed to a routing processing method in a packet transmission for an input packet which is an object to be routed. The method comprises performing a process for identifying an application for transmission of the input packet; performing a process for setting a timer value provided for the identified application; performing a process for routing the input packet to determine a transmission destination port

-15-

on the basis of a destination address stored in a routing table; and performing a process of abandoning the input packet or transferring the input packet to a predetermined route when the routing process exceeds the set timer value.

The last recited limitations are not found in Graham-Cumming. The examiner apparently equates the timer value of applicant's invention to the timer utilized in Graham-Cumming as explained in the Graham-Cumming patent, for example, in column 4, line 6-9. According to this portion of the reference, it is stated:

> The packet analysis module periodically checks the application-port mapping table, and removes associations that have expired. In one embodiment, the expiration time of an application port association is based on the timestamp of the last packet that matched the port of the association, plus a local timeout value (a fixed number of seconds).

As may be seen from this description and from other descriptions within the reference, the reference teaches deleting associations - that is the associations defined by the application-port mapping table once the time period associated with a particular use of that application-port mapping has expired. The expiration may be measured, for example, by means of the timestamp of the last packet that matched the port of the mapping table. In contrast, applicant's invention does not remove the associations of the application and the port (within a mapping table for example) but rather, applicant's time value measures the time during which a routing process takes place. If the routing process cannot take place within a particular set value of time, then the input packets are abandoned or they are routed to a predetermined route. The concept of abandoning the input packets if the routing cannot take place within a preset time is completely absent in the Graham-Cumming teaching. Likewise, the concept of deleting the application-port mapping correspondence is completely absent in applicant's specification. The only thing in common in this connection is that both the reference and applicant utilize a time value and do something upon the expiration of the time value. However, what applicant does and the limitations that are recited in connection with applicant's time value, namely the abandonment of the packet or the routing to a predetermined route if the routing process exceeds a set time value, is completely different from that disclosed in Graham-Cumming. As such, Graham-Cumming cannot be utilized as

an anticipatory reference because it fails to disclose an important claim limitation recited in applicant's independent claim 1.

Limitations similar to those contained in claim 1 are also found in claim 2. Claim 2 recites that the timer value corresponds to a maximum time set for completion of the routing of the input packet. Moreover, claim 2 recites a routing and transferring means for determining a transmission destination port on the basis of a destination address stored in a routing table for routing the input packet to the transmission destination port and for disposing of the input packet or transferring the input packet to a preliminarily determined route dependent on the identified application when a time for routing of said input packet exceeds the timer value. Again, as explained in connection with claim 1, no such corresponding teaching is found in Graham-Cumming. Thus, Graham-Cumming cannot be utilized as an anticipatory reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

In order for a reference to anticipate applicant's claims, the reference must disclose each and every limitation found in the claim. This is certainly not the case here, and thus the § 102 rejection must be withdrawn.

Applicant's dependent claim 3 is deemed to be patentable at least for the same reasons indicated above with regard to claim 2 from which it depends.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the examiner has indicated that claims 4-6 and 14-15 are allowed pending resolution of the § 112 issues and that claims 7-13 and 16-20 are objected to but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In view of the amendments made hereto and the comments set forth above, it is submitted that applicant's rejected claims 1-3 are likewise patentable over the prior art. Moreover, applicant has reviewed all of the claims and made revisions thereto in order to place these claims more in compliance with U.S. practice and to fully comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is submitted that all of applicant's claims are now in condition for allowance.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date <u>February 10, 2004</u>

By

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257

015.616047.1